1

2

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

BRIAN C. APPLEGATE,

VS.

N. CLARK, et al.,

Plaintiff,

Defendants.

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19 20

21

22 23

24

25

26

27 28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

1:15-cv-00207-LJO-EPG-PC

ORDER RE PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF VOLUNTARY DISMISSAL (ECF No. 21.)

ORDER VACATING SETTLEMENT CONFERENCE IN THIS CASE SCHEDULED BEFORE MAGISTRATE JUDGE BARBARA A. MCAULIFFE ON SEPTEMBER 29, 2016 AT 9:00 A.M. (ECF No. 19.)

ORDER VACATING JULY 28, 2016 ORDER AND WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS AD TESTIFICANDUM TO TRANSPORT INMATE WITNESS BRIAN C. APPLEGATE, CDCR# F-66552 ON SEPTEMBER 29, 2016 AT 9:00 A.M. (ECF No. 20.)

ORDER DIRECTING CLERK TO CLOSE **FILE**

Brian C. Applegate ("Plaintiff") is a state prisoner proceeding pro se in this civil rights action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and related state law claims. This action was initiated by civil complaint filed by Plaintiff in the Kings County Superior Court on December 1, 2014 (Case #14-C0325). On February 4, 2015, defendants Clark, Graves, Robicheaux-Smith, and Caviness removed the case to federal court under 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a). (ECF No. 1.)

1

2

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

2324

2526

27

28 ///

This case is scheduled for a Settlement Conference on September 29, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. before Magistrate Judge Barbara A. McAuliffe in Courtroom 8 at the United States District Court in Fresno, California, and a Writ of *Habeas Corpus ad Testificandum* was issued on July 28, 2016, to transport Plaintiff to attend the settlement conference in person. (ECF Nos. 19, 20.)

On August 15, 2016, Plaintiff filed a notice of voluntary dismissal of the Complaint. (ECF No. 21.) Plaintiff also requests the Court to vacate the Settlement Conference and the Writ of *Habeas Corpus ad Testificandum*. (Id.)

The Court construes Plaintiff's notice of voluntary dismissal as a notice of dismissal under Rule 41(a)(1). In Wilson v. City of San Jose, the Ninth Circuit explained:

Under Rule 41(a)(1), a plaintiff has an absolute right to voluntarily dismiss his action prior to service by the defendant of an answer or a motion for summary judgment. Concha v. London, 62 F.3d 1493, 1506 (9th Cir. 1995) (citing Hamilton v. Shearson-Lehman American Express, 813 F.2d 1532, 1534 (9th Cir. 1987)). A plaintiff may dismiss his action so long as the plaintiff files a notice of dismissal prior to the defendant's service of an answer or motion for summary judgment. The dismissal is effective on filing and no court order is required. <u>Id.</u> The plaintiff may dismiss some or all of the defendants, or some or all of his claims, through a Rule 41(a)(1) notice. <u>Id.</u>; <u>Pedrina v. Chun</u>, 987 F.2d 608, 609-10 (9th Cir. 1993). The filing of a notice of voluntary dismissal with the court automatically terminates the action as to the defendants who are the subjects of the notice. Concha, 62 F.2d at 1506. Unless otherwise stated, the dismissal is ordinarily without prejudice to the plaintiff's right to commence another action for the same cause against the same defendants. Id. (citing McKenzie v. Davenport-Harris Funeral Home, 834 F.2d 930, 934-35 (9th Cir. 1987)). Such a dismissal leaves the parties as though no action had been brought. Id.

Wilson v. City of San Jose, 111 F.3d 688, 692 (9th Cir. 1997). In this case, no defendant has filed an answer or motion for summary judgment. Therefore, Plaintiff's notice of dismissal is effective on the date it was filed. Accordingly, the Settlement Conference and the Writ of *Habeas Corpus ad Testificandum* shall be vacated, and this case shall be closed.

Based on the foregoing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Plaintiff's notice of voluntary dismissal, filed on August 15, 2016, is effective as of the date it was filed;

	_
	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	2
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
2	7
2	8

- 2. The Settlement Conference scheduled for September 29, 2016 at 9:00 a.m. in this case before Magistrate Judge Barbara A. McAuliffe in Courtroom 8 is **HEREBY VACATED** from the Court's calendar;
- 3. The Court's order of July 28, 2016, ordering that a Writ of *Habeas Corpus ad Testificandum* issue, and the Writ of *Habeas Corpus ad Testificandum* issued on July 28, 2016, commanding the production of inmate Brian C. Applegate, CDCR# F-66552, are **HEREBY VACATED**;
- 4. This action is **DISMISSED** in its entirety without prejudice; and
- 5. The Clerk of the Court is **DIRECTED** to close the file in this case and adjust the docket to reflect voluntary dismissal of this action pursuant to Rule 41(a).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 16, 2016 /s/ Lawrence J. O'Neill UNITED STATES CHIEF DISTRICT JUDGE